

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

Room No. – 308, 2nd Floor, August Kranti Bhawan,
Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi – 110066.
Website: cic.gov.in

File No. CIC/KY/A/2016/001272

Appellant : Mr. Vincent D'Souza
Pearl Colony, A/5, Stage
Dr. B.A. Road, Dadar (East)
Mumbai-400014, Maharashtra

Public Authority : The Dy. Registrar & CPIO
National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Upbhokta Nyay
Bhawan F-Block, GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi-110023

Date of Hearing : 27.09.2016
Date of Decision : 27.09.2016

Presence:

Appellant : Absent
CPIO : Shri H C Joshi, Assistant Registrar & CPIO

FACTS:

- I. Vide RTI application dated **06.02.2016**, the Appellant sought information on **sole issue**.
- II. CPIO, vide its response dated **22.02.2016**, has allegedly provided the information to the Appellant.
- III. The First Appeal (FA) was filed on **09.03.2016**, as desired information not provided.
- IV. First Appellate Authority (FAA), is not on record.
- V. Grounds for the Second Appeal filed on **12.05.2016**, are contained in the Memorandum of Second Appeal.

HEARING

Appellant opted to be absent despite of our due notice to him. Respondents appeared before the Commission personally and made the submissions at length.

DECISION

It is pertinent to mention here that the appellant, vide his RTI Application dated **06.02.2016**, sought information from the respondents on **sole issue**. Respondents, vide their response dated **22.02.2016**, provided the required information to the appellant. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid response, FA was filed by the appellant on **09.03.2016** before

the FAA, who **could not take up** the same for its disposal **for the reasons best known to him**.

2. The Commissioner heard the submissions made by respondents at length. The Commission also **perused** the case-file **thoroughly**; specifically, **nature of issues** raised by the appellant in his RTI application dated **06.02.2016**, respondent's response dated **22.02.2016**, other material made available on record and also the grounds of memorandum of second appeal.
3. In view of the **position** above and in the **circumstances** of the case, the Commission is of the considered view that the respondents have provided the required information to the appellant in terms of **Section 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005**. In view of this, the Commission feels that the appellant's second appeal becomes **redundant** in this regard. Thus, the appellant's second appeal deserves to be **dismissed**. Therefore, it is **dismissed**.
4. Apart from above, the appellant's second appeal is also a **non-pressed**, despite of our due notice to him.

The Appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
(M.A. Khan Yusufi)
Information Commissioner

Authenticated true copy

(Krishan Avtar Talwar)
Deputy Secretary

The Dy. Registrar & CPIO
National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission,
Upbhokta Nyay Bhawan F-Block,
GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi-110023

Mr. Vincent D'Souza
Pearl Colony, A/5, Stage
Dr. B.A. Road, Dadar (East)
Mumbai-400014, Maharashtra